

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Levern Starr,)	C/A No.4:13-cv-1033-RBH-KDW
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
)	
Solicitor Patricia Singleton Parr,)	
)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, brought this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On September 26, 2013, Defendant Parr filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. ECF No. 48. As Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered an order on September 27, 2013, pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising him of the importance of motions to dismiss and of the need for him to file an adequate response. ECF No. 49. Plaintiff was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, Defendant's motion may be granted, thereby ending this case.

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's *Roseboro* order, Plaintiff has failed to respond to the motion. As such, it appears to the court that he does not oppose the motion and wishes to abandon this action. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff is directed to advise the court whether he wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment by **November 21, 2013**. Plaintiff is further advised that if he fails to respond, this action will be recommended

for dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See Davis v. Williams*, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.



November 5, 2013
Florence, South Carolina

Kaymani D. West
United States Magistrate Judge